A Critique of Habermas and the Public Sphere – as Legal Paper from Althusser – In Support of Althusserianism and the Law

By Shomit Sirohi

I. The previous two papers were about – Habermas and the Law

First we argued that the law is free, and just a modernist update of the Paulinian epistle – just a democratic adjustment to the force of ethics and then the second paper went into the complication of public sphere and deliberations, as if it can be a democratic ensemble with

common people and feudal people opposed to the left in a progressive view of how the law deliberates. Like a debate as it were in idealism.

II. Althusserian Critique of Habermas – So first the Philsopher and then his debate – like Hegel and the Law debating – what if there is Spirit nonetheless – Athena like an Absolute Spirit from the ashes.

Althusser defends in fact a engaged stance – he means the thesis of Habermas is conflicted with Marxism which is arguing for a concrete trade union, party and legal debate

format of things – is then conflicted therefore with the proletarian edge – now we argue for Hegel or Spinoza – in fact my anti-philosophy reveals – that the law is pure – it is fully in line with Wittegensteinians and music – in fact it is a lyrical process of the subject of – Paul with full force, but in good meaning – like be careful – you are now Lenin.

Therefore the scripture is translated, but in good will – can one simply understand good is good will as the old Rousseau argues – hold back the philosopher – he is a weapon in class struggle.

Althusser therefore is formalized – the Habermas argument with Foucault was about how Foucault was against the process format of historical achievements of the bourgeoisie actually – he was in fact more with the PCF quite directly and by force, he means resistance is finally about class power.